



IDENTIFICATION OF REGIONAL AND STATEWIDE MOTORIZED TRAILS ISSUES

The Public Workshop Process

During the February 25, 2003 Motorized Trails Steering Committee Meeting, committee members voiced a concern that simply having public-sector recreation providers (land managers) vote to identify top regional issues would not adequately represent the needs of riding organizations and other enthusiasts.

To resolve this issue, OPRD staff used an issue prioritization process in both afternoon (land manager) and evening (general public) sessions to identify top regional issues generated during the workshop. Issue prioritization results were to be passed on to steering committee members for selecting top regional and statewide issues to be included in the final motorized trails plan.

During the months of April and May 2003, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) staff conducted a series of 9 regional trails issues workshops across the state. Table 1 (below) includes the locations of each of the workshops and the specific trails planning region to which the issue comments were assigned. Please note that some regions had more than one workshop.

Table 1. Regional Trails Issues Workshops

Trails Planning Region	Workshop Location
Northwest Region	Lincoln City
	Portland
	Eugene
Southwest Region	Bandon
	Grants Pass
North Central Region	Bend
South Central Region	Klamath Falls
Northeast Region	LaGrande / Union
Southeast Region	Burns

Each workshop included an afternoon session open to all public recreation providers (including federal and state agencies, county, municipal, port and special district recreation departments, and American Indian Tribes) and an evening session open to the general public (including interested members of the public, trail user groups or clubs, commercial organizations or other organizations). Trails issues were defined as high-impact issues related to recreational trail opportunities in the region. Trail issues could be related to outdoor recreation areas, programs and projects. At the conclusion of each workshop, each participant was given 3 colored dots to assist in prioritizing the importance of issues gathered. Participants placed their colored dots on those issues they felt were of most important in the planning region.

Approximately 230 people attended a workshop, including representatives from 56 public-sector recreation provider organizations. During the workshops, 281 motorized trails issue comments were gathered and recorded.

Next, all comments gathered at the regional public recreation provider and general public workshops were posted on the trails planning website for a comment period from March 19 to July 16, 2003. The site was developed for electronic submittal of comments. A letter was sent out to all workshop participants requesting that they review the website comments list to ensure that their comment(s) had been recorded properly. In addition, a letter was sent to trail user groups or clubs and commercial organizations across the state requesting additional comments through the website.

A complete listing of all issues gathered at the workshops and through the website can be found on the trails planning website at http://www.prd.state.or.us/trailsplanning_regional_issues.php

Identification of Top Regional Issues

Following the issue collection process, OPRD staff developed an issue summary paper to assist the Motorized Steering Committee members in the process of identifying top regional issues. This issues summary paper was distributed to each steering committee member on August 19, 2003.

A regional issues analysis section in the issue summary paper included a prioritized issues list from each of the regional workshops with separate listings for public provider and general public workshops. An additional section included a summary of the combined prioritization results of all workshops held in the region (including all workshop locations and sessions). Those issues receiving the highest total accumulation of dots from all public provider and general public workshops held in the region were shown in bold.

During the September 16, 2003 Motorized Steering Committee Meeting, committee members used a voting process to identify top regional motorized issues to include in the plan.

List of Top Regional Motorized Issues

The following is a list of the top 3 Motorized Trails issues in their respective region.

Northwest Trails Planning Region

(Includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn and Benton Counties)

A. There is a need for adequate and consistent information resources including signs, maps, regulation and level-of-difficulty information, brochures, websites and a central statewide website to access such information in a single location.

B. There is a need for new trails within the region including loop trails.

C. There is a need to better manage for trail-related environmental impacts and resource protection through careful selection of riding area locations, planning, design, public education and understanding the capacity limits of motorized areas.



Southwest Trails Planning Region

(Includes Coos, Curry, Josephine, Jackson and Douglas Counties)



A. Need to increase motorized trail and trailhead capacity within the region by developing motorized recreation opportunities on private timberlands and designating trails/areas for motorized use including trails currently used in that manner.

B. Need for increased user education (rules, regulations, restrictions, environmental) and safety training in the region.

C. Need to provide managed motorized areas within the region to better protect natural resources and reduce the number of neighbor complaints. Many impacts are the result of enthusiasts riding in areas not appropriate for motorized use.

Northcentral Trails Planning Region

(Includes Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Jefferson,

Wheeler, Deschutes and Crook Counties)

A. Use snow park areas for OHV use during summer months such as currently occurring at Edison.

B. Agencies should not close/eliminate OHV trails within the region as a result of resource damage. Rather, OHV trails should be either repaired or rerouted to minimize resource damage.

C. Need for more Class II (4-wheel drive jeeps, SUVs) riding opportunities in the region. This includes a wide variety of Class II riding opportunities—particularly technical riding areas.



Southcentral Trails Planning Region

(Includes Klamath and Lake Counties)



A. Need for more designated motorized areas to accommodate increasing numbers of OHV enthusiasts in the region. Unfortunately, the current trend is for closing existing riding opportunities within the region.

B. Need for interagency cooperation for development of a seamless long-range trail system across jurisdictional boundaries.

C. Need for increased management (safety, environmental and regulatory) of OHV riding areas within the region

Northeast Trails Planning Region

(Includes Wallowa, Union, Grant and Baker Counties)

A. There is a need for standardized trail signage to provide consistency and continuity between the riding areas in the region. Resource managers should use a common set of trails signing, information and regulatory standards.

B. Need for additional motorized camping areas and related facilities (staging areas, restrooms and amenities) to minimize damage to existing riding areas within the region.

C. Need for more motorized trails throughout the region, especially in Baker, Pine and Wallowa Valley Ranger Districts



Southeast Trails Planning Region

(Includes Harney and Malheur Counties)



A. Need to consider OHV use of roads proposed for closure or abandonment and to review recreational use on roads previously closed or abandoned

B. Need for designated and managed OHV areas for ATVs and motorcycles to proactively growing levels of resource degradation associated with off-road vehicle use within the region.

C. Need for safety information and training for young adults (over 15 years of age) who are beginning to ride snowmobiles in the region.

Identification of Top Statewide Motorized Issues

In addition, OPRD staff further refined and summarized all regional motorized issue comments into a set of statewide issue categories. The number of issue comments collected in a given category provided a measure of the relative importance of the issue category to workshop and internet participants. The following tables included the results of this categorical analysis:

- Categorical analysis for motorized issue comments gathered at all public provider workshops across the state. Key issues were identified based on the total number of public provider comments.
- Categorical analysis for motorized issue comments gathered at all general public workshops across the state. Key issues were identified based on the total number of general public comments.
- Categorical analysis for motorized issue comments gathered at all public provider and general public workshops across the state. Key issues were identified based on the total number of public provider and general public comments.

Finally, a matrix was developed to summarize results from these tables.

During the September 16, 2003 steering committee meeting, OPRD staff used a sheet including information presented in the first 2 columns of Table 2 (below) to provide steering committee members an opportunity to vote for a set of top Statewide Motorized Trail Issues. Table 2 includes the total number of committee member votes each issue received. Those issues with the highest number of votes (shown in bold in Table 2) were determined by the steering committee to be 4 Statewide Motorized Trail Issues.

Table 2. Identification of Top Statewide Motorized Trail Issues

Motorized Trail Issue	Total # of Comments From Issue Scoping	# of Committee Votes
Need For Adequate & Consistent Information Resources	40	0
Need For Regional Interagency Coordination/Cooperation in Trail Planning & Management	28	5
Need To Better Manage For Environmental Impacts	28	0
Need For User Education/Training (Regulatory & Safety Information)	27	5
Need For New Trails/Managed Riding Areas	27	7
Need For Additional Law Enforcement/Emergency Response	20	2
Need For Trailheads & Support Facilities (Restrooms, Parking, Camping)	16	2
Concern About Trail Closures/Loss of Riding Opportunities	14	3
Need For a Wider Variety of Challenge Opportunities (From Children's Play Areas to Hill Climb Areas)	12	1
Need For Trail Maintenance/Rehabilitation	12	0
Need To Address User Conflicts/Multiple Use	10	0
Need For Better Trail Planning & Design	10	0
Need to Explore Recreation Opportunities on Private Timberlands	10	0
Need For Close-To-Home Riding Opportunities (Near Urban Areas)	10	1
Need To Connect Existing Trail Systems	9	1
Need For Additional & Alternative Funding Sources	7	1
Need to Consider Roads Proposed For Closure or Abandonment for Motorized Use	6	2
Need For More Snow Parks/Snowmobile Trails	5	0
Need To Consider Motorized Trail Development as an Economic Development Tool	5	0
Need To Revise the ATV Grant Application Process	5	0
Need For 4-Wheel Drive Vehicle Trails	4	2
Need For OHV Vendors & Manufacturers to Take a Greater Responsibility For OHV Management	3	0
Confusion Over Trail Pass Requirements	2	0
Need More "OHV Educated" Federal Staff	2	2
Need To Consider Snow Parks & Snowmobile Trails For Summer OHV Use	2	0
Need To Prepare For Emerging Trail Technologies (Segway, Geocaching)	2	0
Need For Diverse Set of Outdoor Recreation Opportunities	1	0

List of Top Statewide Motorized Issues

Table 2. Top Statewide Motorized Issues

A.	Need For New Trails/Managed Riding Areas
B.	Need For Regional Interagency Coordination/Cooperation in Trail Planning & Management
C.	Need For User Education/Training (Regulatory & Safety Information)
D.	Concern About Trail Closures/Loss of Riding Opportunities